CALIFORNIA CITIZENS COMPENSATION COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED HEARING HELD ON JUNE 16, 2010

TRANSCRIBED BY: MICHAEL C. ROWELL, RPR, CSR 13494

ORIGINAL

- MR. MURRAY: Yes, Good morning. I'd like to call the
- meeting to order, if I could. Everybody, please have a seat.
- 3 I'd like to welcome you here.
- 4 And the first order is having a roll call in order to
- 5 confirm that we are all here and have the ability to vote. And
- 6 I'll defer to you, Debbie Baldwin.
- MS. BALDWIN: Okay. Charles Murray.
- MR. MURRAY: Here.
- 9 MS. BALDWIN: Kathy Sands.
- MS. SANDS: Here.
- 11 MS. BALDWIN: Ruth Lopez Novodor.
- MS. NOVODOR: Here.
- MS. BALDWIN: William Feyling.
- MR. FEYLING: Present.
- MS. BALDWIN: John Stites.
- MR. STITES: Here.
- MS. BALDWIN: Scott Somers.
- MR. SOMERS: Here.
- MS. BALDWIN: We have a quorum.
- MR. MURRAY: Thank you very much.
- 21 First off, everybody does have a copy of our schedule,
- but I'd like to go off record -- or off schedule and thank all
- of the work that Ms. Baldwin has done in keeping us on track
- and getting a lot of the data to us, a lot of the public
- e-mails and all the letters that have come in -- getting them

- all to us and to the group here on time.
- Also, to Nancy Green and Liz Russell, who are Debbie's,
- 3 as I understand it, right hand and left hand, respectively --
- 4 MS. BALDWIN: Right and left.
- MR. MURRAY: -- and have also done a good job. And as
- I said at the last meeting -- but I'll say it again because I
- 7 think it is important, and it's a compliment straight to
- 8 Debbie -- outside, you used to see reams of the paperwork that
- 9 were there for available -- the DPA under Debbie has spent a
- 10 lot of hours, and everything is now on the web site.
- 11 So any reports, the minutes of all our meetings, any
- 12 letters we get in, any of the surveys we get in are on our web
- site. So you can go to the DPA web site and get any data that
- 14 you want. And again, Debbie, you've really done a great job on
- 15 it. Thank you.
- 16 Getting back to the schedule, we have the minutes. We
- 17 all have seen them on the web site. They have been e-mailed to
- 18 us.
- Does anybody have any comments on the minutes to add or
- 20 correct?
- MS. SANDS: Yes.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MS. SANDS: Yes, I did Mr. Chair. I noticed on the
- first page when the roll call was being done, there is question
- 25 marks by some of us -- you know, Debbie Baldwin, Kathy Sands,

- 1 question mark. What is all that about?
- MS. BALDWIN: The question marks?
- MS. SANDS: Yeah.
- 4 MS. BALDWIN: I don't know. She may have been unsure
- 5 when she was transcribing. We sent this out to a private
- 6 company to be transcribed, which was a different company than
- 7 we had used previously. And there were some errors in those
- 8 transcribed minutes, so I corrected the roll call portion of
- 9 it.
- MS. SANDS: Okay. Yeah. I noticed that.
- MS. BALDWIN: Actually, Kathy, it did not include the
- 12 first two or three members when I was taking roll back in
- 13 April.
- MS. SANDS: Is that right? Yeah.
- MS. BALDWIN: And so I had to add those back in,
- 16 because --
- MS. SANDS: Okay. Well, that's unfortunate.
- MS. BALDWIN: Yeah.
- MS. SANDS: Okay. Well, then, if we go to page -- let
- 20 me get these over here -- page 43 of the minutes, line 11, it
- 21 talks about Ruth Lopez's comments.
- Then it goes down to line 25 -- 24, Chuck says, "Okay.
- Thank you," to Ruth.
- And then it says Ruth Lopez Novodor again. Okay.
- Well, I made some notes. That's me. As I read these over from

- line 25, it should be Kathy Sands, and down to line 14. So
- 2 that's where I'm at. This -- as I'm reading it, this sounds
- 3 like me, and it was.
- MS. BALDWIN: Okay. All right, Kathy. Thank you.
- MS. SANDS: So I'd like to move to make that amendment.
- 6 So I don't know if there's anything else --
- 7 MS. NOVODOR: I do have an amendment.
- 8 MS. SANDS: -- per corrections.
- 9 MS. NOVODOR: A correction to the notes. In several
- 10 places, the transcript identifies Gus Demas as the speaker, and
- 11 actually it was Bill Curtis.
- MS. SANDS: Yeah.
- MS. NOVODOR: So I'd like to make that correction, and
- I will read into the minutes. It is on page 47, lines 15 and
- 18; page 48, line 1, 9, 14, 17, 23; and page 49, line 4, 10,
- 16 13, and 16. That's it.
- MR. MURRAY: Do we have anything else?
- MS. SANDS: I don't.
- MR. MURRAY: Nothing?
- MR. SOMERS: Mr. Chairman, I have a comment.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Scott?
- MR. SOMERS: And maybe it's the transcription or the
- information that we provide, but more than in the past there
- have been quite a few unidentified speaker indications there.
- And I think where at all possible, we need to be furnishing the

- 1 names of those people for records for the minutes.
- MS. SANDS: Okay. Let me tell you, we won't be using
- 3 this transcription service again, so we will be using a
- 4 different service. So hopefully we will eliminate those
- 5 problems.
- 6 MR. MURRAY: Sounds like problem solved.
- MS. SANDS: Okay.
- 8 MR. MURRAY: Ruth? Do you have anything to add to the
- 9 minutes?
- MS. NOVODOR: I do not.
- MR. MURRAY: Oh. I thought you were waiving your hand.
- 12 Bill?
- MR. FEYLING: Well, just for the record, I guess I'd
- like to first make a motion that we accept the minutes with the
- 15 corrections as noted.
- MS. NOVODOR: Second.
- MR. MURRAY: Any other comments? Any discussion?
- 18 All in favor?
- 19 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
- MR. MURRAY: All opposed? It is passed. The minutes
- of the April 22nd meeting are hereby approved.
- Opening comments; as far as I'm concerned, my comments
- are just to iterate the last meeting we had -- under
- 24 Proposition 1A, we were bound not to act until we received a
- letter from the State saying that there is or isn't money in a

- reserve fund. We have received the letter. Everybody on the panel has seen it.
- Not to our shock, there is no money in the reserve

 fund; so hence under Proposition 1A, our actions are restricted

 to either maintain the status quo on the salaries and the

 benefits or having a salary or benefit lowering -- salary

 reduction.
 - So that's what we're going to speak about today: What we're going to do on the benefit area and what we're going to do on the salary area. That will be my opening comments for now.
- But do you have anything to start off the ball with,

 there?
- MS. SANDS: Well, do we want --
- MR. MURRAY: To Kathy.
- MS. SANDS: We're going to have some staff report, and then we'll have some public testimony.
- MR. MURRAY: All right.
- MS. SANDS: And then we'll be discussing it again.
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MS. SANDS: Well, I guess I'd like to say that last
 year, I feel we did the right thing by reducing the salaries by
 la percent. And that made a big impact, and I think that was a
 pretty big cut.
- Then earlier this year, I felt because of the financial UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

8

10

crisis in the State and the Governor's proposal to reduce salaries by 10 percent that maybe we should look at that and reduce them 10 percent. And that's what we talked about at our last meeting.

But right now, I'm feeling -- I'm looking forward to some public comment -- but right now, I'm feeling that we should just maybe stay status quo for right now. I understand there is a lot of negotiating -- negotiations going on, and we don't have a final approved budget. It's too bad we don't have that, because then we'd know more where we're at -- but we don't.

So I really feel that we would still be fiscally responsible and conservative if we do just leave the salaries and the benefits and the per diems alone. Last year, we made that big hit, and so I'm kind of thinking that we should just stay status quo and leave things the way they are.

And then next year, we'll have an idea more about where the budget ended up and where we'll be for next year. So that's what I'm thinking.

MR. MURRAY: Okay.

MS. SANDS: Okay?

MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

John?

MR. STITES: Well, considering that we don't have a budget, I think it's a very reasonable position, and I concur.

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

1

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 We did the right thing last year, and perhaps it demonstrated
- that this commission has the resolve to do the right thing.
- But I think we're probably going to have to get a good look at
- 4 that budget to see where they go.
- 5 We generally base this -- and we based it last year --
- on the reductions that were suffered by the state employees.
- And until we can see what they're doing with it, which they
- 8 don't seem to be willing to come to the table, I think we're
- 9 kind of stuck between a rock and a hard place.
- 10 MR. MURRAY: Great. Thank you.
- Bill, do you have anything to add?
- MR. FEYLING: No. I have no comments at this time.
- 13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- MR. MURRAY: Ruth?
- MS. NOVODOR: Yeah. I just wanted to compliment both the staff and this committee for doing the additional research
- this year. Where we used to meet only once, we met a few more
- 18 times this year and really dug into areas that were
- 19 questionable. My position at this time, after looking at
- everything, the outlier for me is that most of the other
- comparable data -- the piece we didn't see was with pension
- options. And those seem to be the biggest differential when we
- look at the fairness of the salaries, which is our job. So I
- too am at the point where I think we need to keep it status quo
- 25 moving forward.

- 1 And that's all for today.
- MR. MURRAY: Great. Thank you.
- Scott? Do you have anything to add?
- MR. SOMERS: Do you want all comments?
- 5 MR. MURRAY: As an opening comment, just as a --
- 6 MR. SOMERS: No. I have nothing as an opening comment.
- 7 MR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.
- 8 Staff reports; do we have any staff reports, as
- 9 requested by the commission?
- MS. BALDWIN: We have no staff reports at this time.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Do we have a list of speakers?
- MS. BALDWIN: We do.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Can I ask you to call the speakers?
- MS. BALDWIN: Jack O'Connell, Superintendent of Public
- 15 Construction.
- MR. O'CONNELL: Great. Thank you very much.
- Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, thank you. I
- have worked up here 28 years -- first time in this building --
- so it's nice to meet you. I have driven by many, many times.
- 20 So thanks for the excuse to come by and say hello. And thank
- 21 you for the work that you do. It's difficult, I know, and
- 22 Sacramento is not always the easiest place to get to, but I
- 23 sincerely appreciate it.
- 24 Certainly, the challenges that California face are
- 25 unprecedented as our prolonged, protracted recession continues

to drag on, and our economy continues to falter. As the elected State Superintendent of Public Construction, I know the impacts that the economy has clearly had on public education.

Our schools are operating today on about \$17 billion less -- with a B -- than we had anticipated just two years ago. The cuts to our schools have been real, felt, and seen and observed.

Consequently, those elected to represent California in these very difficult and troubled times have a heavier burden today than ever before to make decisions that really best serve Californians now and in the future. Clearly, we would all agree. And from your earlier comments, I'm encouraged we do need to have smart, thoughtful decision making made down the street at the State Capitol.

This commission should recognize this heightened responsibility of our elected officials and the need now today more than ever before to be able to continue to attract highly qualified policy makers that truly represent a wide perspective, that represent all of us in California, and to have that wide perspective of their views heard at the state capital.

A further salary cut on top of what we calculate is a 26 percent reduction that was imposed last year by this commission that's already been mandated would be another blow to our ability to find effective, highly qualified members of

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

1.5

2.0

1 the state legislature.

The salary that was set when the legislature became full-time in 1967 adjusted to today's dollars, if you use a CPI, would be slightly over \$111,000. Members at that time had a pension plan. Today's legislators are paid less than they are when representing many more citizens, and all of us would agree the challenges are greater and the complexities of the issues involved much deeper, as well.

Now, do we want to have a legislature where only the very wealthy are able to serve? Do we want to have an aristocracy or a legislature where people have to focus on outside jobs and outside income instead of focusing the job on being the full-time legislator that the voters of this state imposed several decades ago?

Do we want to lose out on the services of many talented individuals with local government experience or school board experience because they would earn perhaps more money by staying home, staying in local government, board of supervisors, city council, and wouldn't have to endure the constant travel and to be separate from their families?

I served for 20 years in the state legislature, and part of my time was to help go out and recruit candidates as part of a position that I held. And I can tell you that after the term limit initiative passed, it was clearly much more difficult to be able to recruit highly qualified, trained and,

yes, electable members to the legislature. They have no pension anymore to be elected to the legislature. None. And local government folks do.

You have the expenses of two houses -- one here, one in your home district -- and you don't receive per diem when you're not up here during the interim. And, of course, you're facing term limits as well, so you come up here for a relatively set period of time.

Do we want to continue to see, quite frankly, the special interests, lobbyists, and the political consultants and staff gain even greater control over the system as the caliber of legislators and their ability to focus on these very complex issues continues to be even further diminished?

As a recent Los Angeles Times editorial made quite clear, there is no legitimate reason for additional cuts and plenty of reasons for the commission to leave law makers' salaries alone. In a bad economy, elected officials should share in the pain. You have made sure that that happened to the tune of 26 percent, and you approved that. And it's been achieved. That's compounded with the per diem reductions and other reductions and vehicles and things on top of the 18.

If you factor it all in, our calculations are 26 percent. And no one else in the state took that big a hit. I mean my wife is a worker at a CSU and is furloughed three days a month and doesn't come close to the 26 percent cut.

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

1 That doesn't come close to the 18 percent cut.

Further cuts, in our opinion, would simply be punitive and frankly would smack of retribution for the legislators daring to disagree with this governor, or any future governor, on legitimate matters of both policy and politic. That does not build the kind of strong legislature that the people of California in this state need to have. That is not the independent course that the people of California expect when they passed Proposition 112 in 1990 to establish this commission — a measure that I campaigned for and support to this day — and really do deserve from this commission. And it is not the constitutional duty that each of you has accepted when you agreed to serve.

And I know you're making personal sacrifices today.

That's why my first comment was thanking you for your service here on this commission.

Your ultimate mission is to set legislative salaries at an appropriate level and to attract -- help us attract the most qualified pool of candidates to make sure that the salaries of the legislators are commensurate with the awesome responsibilities that they clearly have. A further cut does not meet that duty. A further cut is just one more nail in the coffin for quality and for effective legislature that can stand equal to the Governor.

Thank you very much for the chance to provide this UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- testimony with you. I believe we have submitted a written copy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
- MR. MURRAY: We thank you very much.
- Any more speakers, Debbie?
- 5 MS. BALDWIN: One more. Brett Granlund.
 - MR. GRANLUND: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. I certainly drew the short straw having to go behind Mr. O'Connell. He's quite eloquent, and he made many of the points that I wanted to make, so I'm not going to delve into them. You already know that there is no pension in the legislature, and a good deal of the public believes that there are.

Mr. O'Connell touched on your constitutional charge.

Your constitutional charge is not to mess with the state

budget; is not to be concerned where there is a budget or isn't

a budget. Your constitutional charge that you took an oath to

faithfully carry out those duties is to make sure that the

salary is appropriate and fair for the job that's being done.

You could wipe out the salaries completely; you would not make a minor nick in the what could be called "budget dust." You can't affect the state budget.

This has turned into completely a politicized action.

It does reek of being punitive and simply trying to smack

legislators because the public is angry when the State's broke.

So who do you go blame? Do you blame the taxpayers? They

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

don't pay enough taxes? Could we be ridiculous enough to throw water in a beehive?

Two weeks from now these guys are going to be deciding whether or not to cut your pay and do that by raising taxes.

You want them to be thoughtful and contract in their deliberations, not to predetermine without any public testimony and say, well, here's what I'm going to do.

So another further cut takes us back to behind 2000, 1997 levels roughly -- 13 years ago. We talked about using the comparison of some state employees -- not all, some -- took a 10 percent cut, which translates with the pension options and so forth to about 14 percent in the high side. Many of those will be restored, if not all of them.

The courts have already moved to block some of those furloughs, and some of the other state agencies have taken less than that. Local governments, retirees and so forth have continued to have their raises, be it modest. They have not had salary reductions. And when you compare the responsibility of being an executive in this state and trying to preside over the budget mess that we have, we have more obligations than we have revenues, and the tough decisions need to be made. But they need to be made on a broad base; not select 120 people -- and by the way, there is only 118 over there right now. We have got a vacancy in the Senate in the Assembly -- but select 120 people; the only 120 people in the entire state of

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

California that are constitutionally barred, even at their own expense, from participating in their own employer's pension plan. It's the only 120 people in the entire state that are punished and constitutionally barred.

Now, if the constitution is good enough to bar them from participating in their employer's retirement plan, it ought to be good enough for this commission to live up to that constitutional charge; not to look into expenses, car allowances, and so forth.

There is a lot of things to go into car allowances. Some of those members drive 100, 150 miles back and forth to come to work. Some fly. That's different than your car allowance. Some have a little district that you could almost walk across. Some have almost 20,000 square miles in their district to cover. There is a lot of variables. And my goodness, \$323 a month? That's entry level, low-level salesmen going out and calling on a few customers, clients for any number of businesses. That's a car allowance that wouldn't be commensurate with that.

You look at a county supervisor, other elected officials that have cars, they're up 8-, \$900 a month at least. And so the whole charge of this commission is to be informed and to be fair and to look at comparatively what is the right salary; not to look for headlines in the press, and not to smack people around for no reason -- no legitimate reason.

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

And lastly, I have been informed, and I want to confirm that this commission is supposed to operate under Robert's Rules of Order. And if, in fact, that is the case -- I don't know if any of you have ever read Robert's Rules of Order, but the Chair does not take a position. The Chair is an independent, unbiased facilitator of a meeting -- not a dictator. The Chair does not announce in the media their preconceived vote absent any public input. And, in fact, the Chair, under Robert's Rules, does not have a vote, except in the event that the Chair's vote would change the outcome of the meeting -- outcome of the decision. The Chair breaks a tie. The Chair does not advocate. The Chair does not comment. Chair does not vote on an action under Robert's Rules, which is supposed to be the framework that you operate under.

But you throw the constitution out the window. You throw Robert's Rules of Order out of the window, and you do what looks good in the press. It's wrong. It's irresponsible. It's reckless. You ought to be restoring the irresponsible, reckless cuts you made last time.

And by the way, I served in the legislature. I couldn't come back under this pay scale now and meet my obligations to my bills. I'm eligible under term limits to finish my career and go to the Senate, but who would want the job? You have got to feed your family, and you have got to be away from your family, and you have got to pay your bills. And

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

2

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to once a year be politicized so that we can get a good press story and act like we're going to attack a \$20 billion deficit by throwing a couple of cents at it — the average citizen out there pays less than \$0.25 a year towards the complete compensation of their legislator, and less than \$0.12 for their senator; less than 25 twenty-five cents for their assemblyman. I don't think taking one one-thousandth of one penny away from that serves anybody, except it reduces income taxes because you're taking high taxpayers and reducing their income so that they can contribute even less to the general fund. That way, you're actually harming the budget of the state of California.

You don't change the operating expenses of the legislature in the State Capitol by adjusting the salaries of the elected officials so that they make less than about 40 percent of the people that work for them. Most of the staff over there will make more money than their bosses, than their legislators. And they already do. So I really would like to see you be a little more thoughtful about your charge and not about what looks good because the State is in a deficit.

Because the people that you're supposed to represent, the Citizen's Compensation Committee, it injures the citizens of this state when you try to dumb down the legislature and try to make it a less desirable place to work and try to attract less desirable people to represent yourselves and all of us. And you can see the public outcry. I mean the public is

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- outraged. They're just real interested in being here, so I
 hope you'll be more thoughtful today. Thank you.
 - MR. MURRAY: All right. Thank you. But if I could -or could I ask you a few things since you were trying to
 clarify my role? And maybe I could speak on my behalf.

MR. GRANLUND: Sure.

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MURRAY: First off, on the press, I have the attitude -- and I think everybody in the State that I work with can substantiate -- if someone from the press calls me, I'm going to call them back. I'm not going to say to them, "No comment. I don't have any comment on this issue."

I think part of our role here is to educate the people on what's going on. What do I mean by that? You have quoted car allowance is \$285 per month.

MR. GRANLUND: 323, I believe.

MR. MURRAY: Oh, 320 a month. What you conveniently left out was they also get their insurance paid for. They get a free gas card and get all of their repairs paid for. Now, by my numbers, which we'll get into, that comes out to almost \$8,000 a year that they get -- a lot more than the allowance -- wait, wait, you had your piece.

MR. GRANLUND: Uh-huh.

MR. MURRAY: What we're concerned with here, and what -- I wouldn't say we're mad, but we are concerned -- we were told and advised that the per diem was when you're in

Sacramento, you go into the legislative office and you sign in.

Okay. From an LA Times article, we just learned you can stay

at home and still sign in and get paid. So I'm concerned from

our standpoint we have been lied to.

We have been -- a law has been put in place to create us, and it was put in place by your representative, President Pro Tem David Roberti, who I have met with several times. And he put the law in place. He took out the retirement benefits, not us. That's in the law. Okay. So when you're criticizing our commission and saying we aren't doing a good job, we are trying to do the job which we're appointed to do. Okay?

MR. GRANLUND: If I just may --

MR. MURRAY: Certainly. Go right ahead.

MR. GRANLUND: Just a couple of things. I want to be clear. This is what leads to this kind of anger. I'm sorry, and I respectfully want to tell you you're misinformed. You do not get your insurance paid for. The State has a liability pool. The State is self-insured on the liability side.

You buy your own insurance when you're a legislator.

You pay your own car insurance, and you name the state

legislature as an additional insured. You make that payment.

You do contribute a portion for the what little bit of personal time you have left. You contribute to a portion of the cost of that vehicle.

And you don't get your repairs. You don't take your UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

wife's or your husband's or your daughter's car down and get your -- those are your car repairs. That's your car.

That car belongs to the state of California. It's not yours. The State maintains their property. That would be like saying you get your office carpeted. Well, it's the State's office. It's not yours, personally. You're only using that car, and you're paying -- the State contributes a portion, and you contribute a portion. And you insure it, and you contribute a portion to your gas and your expenses. So those car repairs are not -- they're not the member's repair. Those are the State's.

Those are the citizens of the state of California that own that car and have an obligation to maintain that car, and you want to start bringing that into the equation. Why would the legislator driving somebody else's car bother to maintain it if you're just going to turn it in, and you're going to have to foot the bill to repair it? Those are the kinds of things -- and it wasn't David Roberti. It was Pete Schabarum, was the big term limit guy. And he was the big advocate of taking away the public employees retirement or the retirement from the legislators while he sits back and draws his NFL retirement and his LA City Counsel retirement and his PERS retirement. He draws three retirements, and yet he had the audacity to say that his peers -- because he didn't happen to like Willie Brown -- are not to have a retirement.

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- But it's that kind of misinformation, and it gets out
- in the press, and you have got a very ill informed public.
- 3 MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- 4 MS. SANDS: Mr. Chairman --
- 5 MR. MURRAY: Wait, wait, wait.
- MS. SANDS: I'm sorry. I didn't get your name.
- MR. GRANLUND: Brett Granlund.
- MS. BALDWIN: Brent?
- 9 MR. GRANLUND: Brett, B-R-E-T-T G-R-A-N-L-U-N-D.
- MS. BALDWIN: G-R-A-M-L-U-N-D?
- MR. GRANLUND: No, G-R-A-N, like in Nancy, L-U-N-D.
- MS. SANDS: Granlund. Yeah. Okay. Thank you for
- having a lot to say, but what is your background? Who are you?
- What is your background? I don't know you.
- Do you know him?
- 16 You have had a lot to say. What is your background?
- 17 Your business?
- MR. GRANLUND: Well, I was in the candy manufacturing
- business for a lot of years, and an outdoor advertising
- business. I served on Yucaipa's city council. I served in the
- 21 legislature.
- MS. SANDS: On what city's counsel?
- MR. GRANLUND: Yucaipa. I served in the legislature in
- the State Assembly from 1994 to 2000. And when I left, I made
- more money than they make today, ten years later, by the way.

MS. SANDS: Thank you for your comments.

MR. GRANLUND: Sure. One last thing. The question mark on the names, that's why I had to spell my name because for the person transcribing this, people spell their names sometimes different than common words; so the question mark means I think that's the proper spelling, not I think that was the person. Thanks.

MR. MURRAY: All right. Thank you.

Any more speakers, Debbie?

MS. BALDWIN: No other speakers.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you very much. Okay. We will move into the discussion area. We have three points that I know of that we're going to discuss. The first is the salary issue, and maybe we'll start with John and work our way east. And if you can say what you would propose on any adjustments we would have for salary and then go to Bill on down.

MR. STITES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned in the opening comments, at this point I think the reduction we made last year was a step in the right direction. But due to the budgetary issues -- and we based that one last year upon the -- I don't want to use the word attack -- but the reductions in the California state employees that they were suffering from.

Now we're getting figures, and statistics are like everything else. We can throw them all around -- say

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

26 percent, 18 percent or whatever it is -- and probably will
never ever have the right answer. But at this point, due to
the fact we don't know what the budget is, we don't know what
impact it will have on the state workers, I don't recommend any

salary reductions, which is the only option we have here --

MR. MURRAY: Okay.

7 MR. STITES: -- other than status quo. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURRAY: Okay, John. Thank you.

10 Bill?

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FEYLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the salaries, I just -- I really appreciate the comments from Jack O'Connell, and I really couldn't have said it better myself. He pretty much hit all the high points that I would have regarding the situation we find ourselves in. I think additional cuts at this point either are punitive or certainly would appear punitive, and I would not support them.

And like I said, you can just go down the list of the issues that Mr. O'Connell brought up, but I concur with his perspective on the issue. Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Great. Thank you. Ruth?

MS. NOVODOR: Yes. Number one is that I wanted to comment on the fact that we, the State -- there are many people talking about different salaries and changes in salaries.

There are a lot of people that are unemployed in California.

1 They don't have a salary.

And many executives in California -- and I'm sure that Scott will address this, hopefully -- many executives in California have seen their salaries cut. I just had to cut 25 percent of my staff, and we're in health care.

These are serious times, and I take a little bit of offense to this being called politicization of the facts, because I believe this commission for the first time this year really is digging into the detail and the data more than has been done in the past.

On the other side of the coin, all of the citizens' input and the reports we heard today are vital to this decision and give us new information. So it is important that people speak up, and if we haven't filled a little black spot that we don't have an answer to, you may be answering that question for us. So we do want to encourage the feedback that we're getting.

Misinformation is a two-sided coin, my friend.

Misinformation is used. That's one of the strongest tools of politics, is misinformation. So I just want to make clear that our initiative, at least mine, is to get as much information in order to make a rational decision. They will never all be perfect, and the information will never be perfect. But I can take the same piece of information and accuse you of being political with it, the way you presented it, or you can accuse

me of being political with it. But let's stop for a minute and take a look at what the data does tell us, and sometimes we'll come to an agreement and sometimes we won't.

This is my conclusion for the salaries -- and I'm sorry I took that little time to give an intro -- is that we have looked -- last year we took a look at all the salaries across the different states and different groups, but the piece that was missing was the pension information. My decision today to remain status quo is because I think there is a huge differential based on the fact the pensions are not included in that analysis, and given that New York, Illinois,

Massachusetts, and many of the states that we were using in comparison do offer pensions, as well as the judges. Even though we're looking at their average compensation, they too receive pensions.

I am of the opinion at this point that the status quo is the appropriate action for this commission. Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: I thank you, Ruth. Very good. Very good summary.

Scott, can I ask you to log in?

MR. SOMERS: I agree with a number of the comments that were made by our speakers and disagree with a number of them.

I am not so concerned about whether the budget has been put to bed or not, nor should we be impacted, in my opinion; nor should we be thought of as a political tool on anyone's part to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

somehow force the legislature or any other part of government to adopt a budget. And I certainly hope -- and I guess I'm offended by the notion that we're somehow a political tool for people.

I have to ask the question, is the State in better financial condition this year than last year? That's a rhetorical question. Do we need to ask our legislators and the Governor to cut other people's compensation in the state? Should they do that without reducing their own compensation?

And I fully admit that we took a big slice last year.

18 percent was a lot. And if you add other things, it is true,
depending on how you calculate it, it could be more than

18 percent.

Our role definitely should not be punitive. But it should take into account some of the comments that were made — the appropriate talent pool; are we able to attract the kinds of people that we want for these roles — and we always should be keeping that in mind.

And I hope -- and it should be part of our job -- to make sure that we are offering compensation to individuals to attract the right level of people to this role.

I come back to financial conditions, and I say that also a comment -- and I'll add this comment first -- that private salaries -- if you look at the private world, private salaries in almost -- in every industry have declined

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

substantially in California and other parts of the country.

Obviously, there are still some people making a lot of money, but that's not the average person out there. The average person out there is making clearly less than they made two, three, four years ago.

Is it wrong to ask public employees to take reductions? People wonder why the government, public employees, and legislators somehow find that so offensive. It's so foreign, I admit, but it's so common in the private world that it creates a big divide. And frankly, I think it unfortunately contributes to a poorer regard for our very hard working legislators and others, which I'm very sorry to see.

In a recent city council meeting, and I won't say what city, one of the city council members who control their own salaries said, "I want to wait to see what the unions are willing to do before we cut our salaries."

In my opinion, that's just very poor leadership. If you need to reduce expenses, you lead from the top. If you don't need to reduce expenses in this state at the present time, I might feel a little differently about this.

Mr. Chairman, I said last time when we talked about 10 percent that I thought that 10 percent was too much. And I still believe 10 percent is too much, but I would be in favor of a 5 percent reduction in compensation. And I think that if the legislature and the Governor are serious about taking

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- expenses out of the rest of the state, they need to lead from the top.
- I would propose a 10 percent reduction.
- 4 MR. MURRAY: Very good, Scott. Thank you.
- 5 Go to you, Kathy.
 - MS. SANDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I made some opening comments, so I kind of let you know the way I feel about it. I appreciate all the comments. I appreciate the public comments, but I'm still feeling the same.

I know, Scott. I know how you feel. I think that earlier in the year, I was really feeling that 10 percent would be a fair reduction, but I think the 18 percent last year that we made was plenty. It was a big hit, as I said earlier today.

I really feel we should just stay status quo, leave the salaries where they are this year, and wait until next year and see where we are. So --

MR. MURRAY: Okay.

MS. SANDS: And I would propose a motion for that when we're ready.

MR. MURRAY: Okay. We actually have two points of view on the floor now. One is a 5 percent reduction across the board, and the other is status quo. Why don't we start off with the 5 percent, because if we pass the status quo, the 5 percent is moot.

Do I hear a motion to reduce the salaries at the 5 UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 percent level?
- 2 MR. SOMERS: I would make a motion to reduce salaries
- 3 at the 5 percent level.
- 4 MR. MURRAY: Do I hear a second? Okay. Not passed.
- 5 Do I hear a motion to maintain a status quo in the salaries and
- 6 benefits?
- 7 MS. SANDS: I would move to make -- I would move that
- 8 we -- what do I want to say? I would move that there be --
- 9 MR. MURRAY: No change?
- MS. SANDS: Yeah. No change in the salaries and status
- 11 quo.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MS. SANDS: Yeah. No change in the salaries and status
- 14 quo.
- MR. MURRAY: Do I hear a second?
- 16 MR. FEYLING: I'll second the motion.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Up to a vote. Do we have
- 18 discussion, or are we --
- MR. STITES: Mr. Chairman?
- MR. MURRAY: Yes, John?
- MR. STITES: We're talking about salaries.
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MR. STITES: Are we talking about the whole package?
- MS. SANDS: Yeah, we are. I should have said that. I
- would move that we -- that the salaries, the benefits, and the

- 1 per diem all stay the same, status quo, for this next year.
- MR. FEYLING: And that's what I seconded.
- 3 MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MS. SANDS: Okay.
- 5 MR. MURRAY: And the other discussion --
- MS. SANDS: Thank you, John. I meant to say that.
- 7 MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- 8 MR. STITES: Well, I'm just -- because it was kind of
- 9 bifurcated last time, so I was trying to see if we were
- 10 examining it as a total package or. . . .
- MR. MURRAY: Scott?
- MR. SOMERS: Yes, Mr. Chair. A point of order on the
- benefits side: If we freeze the benefits, they will not be
- able to have increases in any new negotiated programs. I was
- planning to make a motion to allow for increases in the health
- 16 program in the contributions to the State for the health
- 17 programs. So if I could ask you to rephrase your motion and
- remove the insurance related benefits, I will submit a separate
- 19 motion.
- MS. SANDS: Okay.
- MR. MURRAY: Just so everybody is clear on what's going
- on here, because of the wording -- and it's strictly the
- wording -- if insurance rates go up, based on the resolution we
- 24 passed last time, we cannot increase the charge back to the
- 25 member or the insured.

- 1 Okay. I believe Scott's --
- MR. SOMERS: We cannot increase the State's
- 3 contribution to the member.
- 4 MR. MURRAY: Right. So this would all be born by the
- 5 State, hence a larger item in the budget, on and on and on.
- 6 MR. SOMERS: No. I'm sorry. It would be born by the
- 7 individual.
- 8 MR. MURRAY: Be born by the individual.
- 9 MR. SOMERS: The State cannot -- currently, the State
- 10 cannot contribute any additional amount, so any new fees. For
- instance, if health care goes up 10 percent, the State cannot
- fund any of that. And the current program, the 8580 program,
- basically has a split between the employee and the State. It
- 14 would mean if the cost by an insurance company negotiated by
- 15 the State goes up that the employee would bear that entire
- 16 cost. I frankly disagree with that, and I have a resolution to
- 17 allow the State to contribute more to that.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Ruth?
- 19 MS. NOVODOR: I'm going to speak to the motion. I am
- fully prepared to vote on the salary issue. I am not prepared
- 21 to vote on the other two. So I will have to cast my vote
- likewise, because I believe there is new information on the
- 23 table that I haven't been -- I think there is new information
- 24 presented today that I have not heard on the other issues.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
 - UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- 1 MS. NOVODOR: So I don't know how you want to handle
- 2 that.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.
- Bill, do you have a comment?
- 5 MR. FEYLING: Well, just a suggestion, I guess, more
- 6 than a comment. But with the concurrence of the maker of the
- motion, I'd withdraw the second. Kathy would withdraw the
- 8 motion and restate the motion --
- 9 MS. SANDS: Okay.
- 10 MR. FEYLING: -- as to salaries only. I'll second
- 11 that. We can vote on that, and then you can take up the
- 12 benefits issue separately.
- MS. SANDS: Let's do that. I'll move that we leave the
- 14 salaries status quo for this next year.
- 15 MR. MURRAY: I think, first you have to --
- MS. SANDS: Yeah. I'm withdrawing my motion.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MS. SANDS: And then I'll propose a new motion, as we
- 19 have talked about, to just reduce the salaries. And I mean
- just leave the salaries status quo for this next year.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MR. FEYLING: I would second that motion, Mr. Chairman.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. We have a second. I don't think we
- 24 have any need for more discussion in that area. I will call
- 25 the vote. May I ask all in favor, please say aye?
 - UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
- MR. MURRAY: All opposed? It is passed. That leads us
- on to the benefits. Contrary to what I had been advised that
- 4 my role is, I would like to have us look at the auto area.
- John? This is his specialty. John, could I ask you to
- 6 address that?
- 7 MS. SANDS: Wait. Can we finish up the benefits?
- 8 Don't we want to finish up the benefits?
- 9 MR. MURRAY: We'll go into that.
- MS. SANDS: We'll go into that? Okay.
- 11 MR. STITES: We're going to add all of these as --
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MR. STITES: I'm assuming then that we're back to
- handling these as separate issues.
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MR. STITES: Okay. Well, basically we have done a lot
- of research on the auto allowance. And as we said before, when
- we request information as a commission, we hope that we get all
- 19 the information. Unfortunately, it's kind of like pulling
- teeth sometimes. But just recently, we were bombarded with a
- lot of information, especially some studies that were done by
- 22 the staff, which we appreciate, that cover different states
- within the nation and what compensation they get.
- In the private industry, contrary to what I heard
- earlier, I don't believe anybody is getting \$900 a month any
 - UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

longer with any corporations, unless they're CEOs of the oil industries or something. The small business people and those operating businesses in the medium range are pretty much giving up all of their compensation, or at least reducing it when it comes to car allowances. The average cost out there is somewhere around 300 now, and if you get a car allowance when you hire on to a new position in any industry, that is a pretty successful position for you.

We reviewed some of -- and some data was put together -- basically the 15,000 miles is the average lease mileage allowable. And the costs, the average allowance is about \$3,600. Insurance is about -- for the Assembly, insurance is about 72. Repairs are about \$900. Gas and oil is another \$3,100. So we total out about \$7,800, which is about \$0.52 a mile.

Now, that's very close to what compensation would be for anyone who was on a mileage program, which a lot of people are. The Senate, of course, has a little bit different numbers, and it comps out to about \$8,400 a year, broken down as I explained in the Assembly, which is about \$0.70 a mile. So that's a little bit more than what we would see if they were compensated through strictly a mileage program using their own vehicles. It's good information. But at this point, it's not enough information for me to make any recommendation for any changes. Because as I have found, it oftentimes happens when

- dealing with government, some new information will show up.
- 2 And before I would make a recommendation to change anything
- 3 within the system, other than the changes we have already made,
- I would have to wait and see what that information is going to
- 5 be.
- 6 MR. MURRAY: I would like to take the chart we have
- 7 here, give it to the State, and have them make a study to
- 8 verify the numbers and make sure we're working with the right
- one. Because I was told that the car -- the insurance bill is
- 10 \$884 per month, and this data -- some of the data we got is
- about \$80. So on the auto, I would like to give the report to
- the DPA and have them come back for the next meeting and tell
- us what the real numbers are.
- Okay? Is that okay, John?
- 15 MR. STITES: I concur.
- 16 MR. MURRAY: Okay. I'd like to move on to the insured
- 17 benefits and refer it back to Scott.
- 18 Scott?
- MR. SOMERS: Mr. Chairman, last year, as we briefly
- 20 mentioned earlier, we passed the resolution to reduce by
- 21 18 percent the State's contribution to each of the insurance
- 22 related benefits. That includes health, dental, vision, long
- 23 term disability, life insurance, the employee assistance
- 24 program, legal services, flexible benefits, long term care,
- deferred compensation, and optional benefits. A number of

those, by the way, are completely self-paid by employees.

Of that amount, the -- if you actually look at the impact of the decision that we made with a roughly 3 percent increase, which is low, for health last year, the total if you add salaries and -- oh. I'm sorry. If you look at the total reduction in the benefits, it basically ranged between 19.6 and 21 percent because of the increases that they didn't get. In other words, the State was prohibited from paying for the increases as well as for the 18 percent reduction.

Under the current resolution, they are frozen at that level, at the actual level, without an ability to get any increases that may be negotiated as part of the program. The health component of that ranges from 82 to 90 percent, depending on the house, the Assembly or the Senate, the constitutional officers; so it clearly is the major expense item.

With regard to benefits -- with regard to categories, I am making the recommendation, summarizing this, that we allow the health benefit to be able to be adjusted in accordance with whatever adjustments are made in the statewide employee 8580 program, which is the program -- the health program for all state employees that also the Assembly, the Senate, and the constitutional officers are part of.

Therefore, with regard to benefit categories for legislative and constitutional officers as they apply,

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

2.3

- including the categories that I mentioned, I make a motion to
 maintain current state funding established by this committee's
 resolution signed in 2009 for all categories, except health.
 - With regard to the health plan, the state contribution can be adjusted but must remain 20 percent lower than the amount otherwise determined by the 8580 plan for the legislative and constitutional officers.

Basically, that preserves the cut that was made last year but allows for any increase that might come along for the State to contribute its appropriate share according to that program.

The other categories are not included in this because they are -- one, they're smaller. They're not automatically adjusted every year, and frankly, administratively they would be difficult to necessarily adjust. And therefore, we have discussed with the health as being the single item on there.

Ralph Cobb, are you here? Ralph Cobb is the benefits manager here with the DPA. And Ralph, do you have any further comments about this?

- MR. COBB: No.
- MR. SOMERS: Let me ask you, then, is this
- 23 administrateable?
- MR. COBB: Oh, yes.

And I want to --

MR. SOMERS: You're a very eloquent guy, Ralph.

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- MR. COBB: No. The 8580 formula is a standard formula
 that's used for the state managers and for some of the
 represented work force. It's used on an ongoing basis, so this
 would run on autopilot really well.
 - MR. SOMERS: The other advantage of this is that the main chunk of this, which again is 80 to 90 percent of the cost, allows employees to gain additional contributions from the State in that program.

Each of the other programs is negotiated separately in each of the different chambers, and as a result, it's more complicated -- much more complicated -- from an administrative perspective, which is why, frankly, I came up with this particular approach, frankly, with great input from Ralph. So that's my motion.

MS. SANDS: I'll second your motion. And thank you so much, Scott, for your expertise. And it's nice to have you aboard. I second your motion.

MR. SOMERS: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Do we have a discussion?

MS. NOVODOR: I do have a question.

MR. MURRAY: Certainly. Ruth?

MS. NOVODOR: It's partially related, directed to

Scott. What is the anticipated increase in health care costs

for the next 12 months?

MR. COBB: That's actually being determined at CalPERS
UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Page 41

- as we meet here, but I would expect it to be right in the 9 or
- 2 10 percent range.
- 3 MS. NOVODOR: Oh boy.
- 4 MR. SOMERS: Which, by the way, was only 3 percent last
- 5 year, so we'll be expecting a three percent increase this year.
- And we want the legislators and constitutional officers to
- 7 take -- I do -- to take advantage and not be injured by not
- being able to take advantage of that increased cost.
- 9 MS. NOVODOR: And thereby, the legislators would be
- 10 unduly penalized --
- MR. SOMERS: Exactly.
- MS. NOVODOR: -- if we didn't pass this motion in this
- 13 way. Thank you for all your work, Scott, digging into the --
- getting into the trenches and pulling this out.
- MR. MURRAY: Do we need a motion?
- MS. SANDS: He made the motion. I seconded it, and
- we're all of those in favor.
- 18 MR. MURRAY: Okay. While in discussion?
- MR. SOMERS: Yeah. We have a motion on the floor.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. All in favor say aye.
- MS. SANDS: Aye.
- MR. MURRAY: Opposed?
- MR. FEYLING: I think we're still in discussion,
- 24 Mr. Chairman.
- MS. SANDS: Oh. Sorry.

- 1 MR. MURRAY: Okay. Certainly. Sorry.
- 2 MR. FEYLING: Thank you. Just so I understand, and 3 maybe this is directed towards the DPA representative.
 - MR. MURRAY: One more time, Ralph.
- 5 MR. FEYLING: Yeah. It's just that you might want to 6 stay close to the microphone, just in case.
 - MR. MURRAY: Unless you need the exercise.
 - MR. FEYLING: Just so I understand the motion that we're voting on, we're going to maintain what is basically the currently structure of the legislator's participation in the health and welfare plan. However, under this motion, the State would be picking up the increases; is that correct?

MR. COBB: What we will do -- the 8580 form is the health benefits formula that the legislators and constitutional officers would be receiving had there been no benefit reductions so that we're just keying the reduction that was put in place last year to the formula rather than to a rate that was at a particular point in time. So then as that formula -- that formula recalculates every year when the new health premiums are set by CalPERS. It's just a mathematical formula.

And so we're just indexing the commission's reduction to the formula rather than to a specific dollar amount so that it can be commensurate with what the legislators and constitutional officers would have received if there had been no reductions rather than them falling further and further

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- behind as each year goes by.
- MR. FEYLING: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. I
- 3 appreciate your input.
- MR. COBB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 5 MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Any more discussion? Okay.
- f I'll start to call the vote. All in favor, say aye.
- 7 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
- MR. MURRAY: All opposed? It is passed.
- The next item on the schedule on nonsalary benefits is
 the per diem, and I believe Kathy Sands helped us out last time
 on the per diem.
- There is really not a lot to discuss as far as what the amount is and so on and so forth. I am concerned, however -- and this is my opinion -- that what has been expressed to all of us about the way some of the benefits work isn't the way it works.
 - The LA Times article stated that the per diem can be paid even though you're still in your home office. We were led to believe by someone that the assemblyman or the senator had to sign in every day to get it. It turns out, by the LA Times article, that that is not the case.
 - I don't know what we can do, and I'll defer to Bill.
- Do we have -- what can we do to find out if this is the law; if we control this; if we do not control this? Who says who gets paid what on the per diem? Who develops the laws?

17

18

19

20

21

Page 44

- MR. CURTIS: I think this would be a job for the staff
 to research and get back to you. We don't have control over

 per diem at the DPA, so. . . .
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. So in order to find out, we can

 ask -- again, back to Debbie -- to find out how it is paid.

 And we have already done this on some of the auto stuff. And

 just tell us, you know -- I hate to have my members up here on

 the panel spend the time like Scott just did. He spent many,

 many hours trying to find out how it works and how we can have

 a resolution to make it easier for the State to do it so

 everybody is not hurt, and then to find out that the

 information we have is wrong.
 - So if I could ask you, Debbie, if you could have your staff look into this and advise back to us what is the procedure to have the per diem paid.
- MS. SANDS: Do they have to be present at the meeting, or. . .
- MR. MURRAY: Right. As I said, if it were not for the
 LA Times article that sort of -- it exposed it, but it also
 said this is done all across the board, half a dozen times a
 year.
- 22 Any other discussion of the noninsured benefits? John?
- MR. STITES: Just a quick question.
- MR. MURRAY: Certainly.
- MR. STITES: Considering we were talking about the UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

13

14

- vehicle allowance, I believe we'll have to make a motion to
- 2 keep it status quo with no change. Or do we?
- MR. MURRAY: Okay. If you want, that's fine. I would
- 4 say --
- 5 MR. STITES: I just want to make sure that --
- 6 MR. MURRAY: I would say that would apply, but it would
- 7 also let me go into my next point.
- 8 MR. STITES: Okay.
- 9 MR. MURRAY: Then that might do it. We have under
- statute by the end of the month to make any change we want to
- do to the benefits. And I'm saying fringe benefits: The
- salary, the per diem, the car allowance. Since the budget is
- due on the 15th of the month, and it's not there and there has
- 14 been -- I'm not sure there is some term for it, but they have
- 15 self-extended the deadline for the budget. I would like to ask
- Bill if we could self-extend our deadline to get any of the
- 17 changes owed to the budget that are due by the end of the
- 18 month.
- 19 MR. FEYLING: Mr. Chairman, I would refer the
- 20 commission to the constitution as more recently amended by
- 21 Proposition 1F, which says that your direction is to, before
- the end of each fiscal year, which would be the June 30th
- deadline each year, the commission shall, by resolution, and
- adopted by the majority of the membership of the commission,
- 25 adjust the medical, dental insurance, and other similar

- benefits of the state officers. So that has not changed from the original direction of the Constitutional Proposition 8 -- or I meant the Proposition 112. I'm sorry. So that's your direction, and I know no authority to either extend or to prevent extension.
 - MR. MURRAY: Okay. I would like to maybe explore an extension. I don't know if it's a resolution or however we can put it, but -- and I don't know if I can proclaim, for lack of a better word, but let's put the motion together that we have expanded all the deadlines for any action we will make until a week prior to the finalization of the state budget. Okay?
 - MR. FEYLING: I'm somewhat confused. I thought your motions were for the resolution. That's what the commission has done in the past. When you make a motion, it's to go into a resolution. Am I in error on that? You have got two motions that you have passed.
- MR. MURRAY: I'm --
- 18 MR. FEYLING: I assume there that --
- MR. MURRAY: I'm in brand-new ground here because -- I
 mean what did the State do to extend their deadline?
- 21 MR. FEYLING: I have no idea what the State does to
 22 extend their deadline. I know the constitution requires
 23 June 15th of each year for the budget. I think today is
 24 June 16th, so --
- MR. MURRAY: Right.

1

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 1 MR. FEYLING: -- I have no idea how they do it.
- 2 MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MR. COBB: Mr. Chair, a question.
- 4 MR. MURRAY: Certainly.
- 5 MR. COBB: Which ones of our resolutions are you
- 6 wishing to hold --
- 7 MR. MURRAY: None. I mean all I'm saying is we have
- 8 until the end of the month to make any changes; like we are
- 9 doing a study on the car; we're doing a study on the per diem.
- And as of now, unless we decide something right now, nothing
- 11 will go into the budget.
- MR. COBB: May I recommend that the motion on salaries
- and insurance related benefits essentially be instituted --
- MR. MURRAY: Definitely, yeah.
- MR. COBB: -- according to the --
- MR. MURRAY: Yeah. This doesn't have anything owed
- 17 to that. All I'm trying to do is to extend the deadline we
- have or to make a change. And if we get any data back in time,
- we can make that change, so may I ask you to make the
- 20 resolution? Because I was told I can't make resolutions.
- MS. SANDS: You can make a motion -- why can't the
- 22 Chair make a motion?
- MR. CURTIS: Under Robert's Rules of Order, the Chair
- 24 cannot make the motion.
- MS. SANDS: They can't?

- 1 MR. CURTIS: They cannot.
- 2 MR. FEYLING: The Chair needs to recognize the motion,
- 3 Kathy.
- 4 MS. SANDS: Yeah. Okay. So you want a motion --
- 5 MR. MURRAY: What he said.
- 6 MS. SANDS: Yeah. Pardon?
- MR. MURRAY: What he said.
- MS. SANDS: What who said?
- 9 MR. MURRAY: Me. Just what he said.
- 10 MS. SANDS: Yeah. I'll just recommend and make a
- 11 motion of Chuck's recommendation.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MR. FEYLING: Point of order, Mr. Chairman --
- 14 MR. MURRAY: Do I hear a second?
- 15 MR. FEYLING: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Robert's
- Rules of Order clearly says that to make a motion, one has to
- state the motion to the Chair. It needs to be seconded, and
- the Chair needs to restate the motion. I think we're getting
- into dangerous ground here when we don't even know what's on
- the floor.
- MS. SANDS: Yeah.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- MS. SANDS: Well, the motion would be that we would be
- able to extend our time. Well, usually -- well, let's talk
- about it a little bit more. The law says that we have to
 - UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

- 1 approve our budget -- I mean make our --
- 2 MR. MURRAY: Our changes.
- MS SANDS: -- recommendations and our changes before
- June 30th, because that's when the budget is supposed to be
- 5 passed. But the budget isn't going to be passed by June 30th;
- 6 right?
- 7 MR. MURRAY: Correct.
- MS. SANDS: It probably isn't. So we'd like to have
- 9 more time. That's what we're talking about; right?
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MS. SANDS: We'd like to have more time, so we would
- want to have like two weeks when the budget -- say the budget
- is passed July 1st -- well, we can't. Say the budget is passed
- 14 on --
- MR. MURRAY: July 15th?
- MS. SANDS: July 15th. We would have two weeks before
- 17 that -- like we'd have to make a decision and make any changes
- in our recommendation by July 1st; right?
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- 20 MS. SANDS: Two weeks. So we would want to have our
- 21 time -- our jurisdiction of our time changed two weeks
- before -- or after the budget is passed. That's what we really
- want to do then. We want two weeks after the budget is passed.
- MR. MURRAY: Right.
- MS. SANDS: Do you think that would work?
 - UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

MR. CURTIS: I think you should hug the shores of the constitution. And it says that you shall submit a single resolution for pay and maybe several resolutions for health benefits, in the way it was changed by Proposition 1F, before the end of the fiscal year. There is nothing in the constitution -- your direction -- that states that it is tied to the budget.

In fact, to the contrary, it doesn't take effect until the first Monday in December thereafter. So I don't know what you can do. I know of no authority that allows you to extend your mandate.

- MS. SANDS: I think we should just leave it alone.
- MR. MURRAY: Okay.
- 14 MS. SANDS: I think we should just leave it alone.
- MS. NOVODOR: I agree.
- MR. MURRAY: Do we have any other comments?
- MS. SANDS: Yeah. Next time, I think we should just
- leave it alone. We're not --
- MS. NOVODOR: Mr. Chairman?
- MR. MURRAY: Yes.
- MS. NOVODOR: I think we have dug into a lot of
 information this year, and I think we have done as much as we
 can do at this point. And this -- we should continue if we
 need to meet again before the end of this year to go over new
 information, because we're constantly getting new information,

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

10

11

- and be updated so that we are prepared for decision making the
- following year -- or following meeting. That's just an
- 3 opinion.

11

- MR. MURRAY: Very well put.
- 5 Anybody else have any discussion on the issue? Okay.
- 6 MR. FEYLING: Bill, through the Chair --
- MR. MURRAY: I'm sorry.

is this going to work?

- MR. FEYLING: I have a question through the Chair. So
 do we need to act on any of these other areas, or can we remain
 silent on them, and then it just maintains the status quo? How
- MR. CURTIS: If you're going to adjust -- to the way I
 read the constitution, if you're going to adjust these items by
 resolution on the -- I mean by vote on the health benefits, if
 you are adjusting something, then it has to be done in a single
 resolution for pay and in other resolutions for benefits before
 the end of the fiscal year.
- MR. FEYLING: Okay.
- MR. CURTIS: That's the history of this commission, and
- I think the status quo vote is probably in the same genre.
- MR. FEYLING: Great. I appreciate it. Thank you.
- MR. MURRAY: So in other words, for clarification, if
- we don't do anything, it's status quo?
- MR. CURTIS: I would say if you don't do anything on
- pay, it's status quo; but you have already made the motion to

make it status quo on pay. 1 MR. MURRAY: Right. MR. CURTIS: On health benefits, you made a motion to 3 allow adjustment. So therefore, you have made resolution to 4 5 adjust, which must be done, again, before the end of the fiscal 6 year. 7 MR. MURRAY: Okay, Bill. Is that satisfactory? 8 MR. FEYLING: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the input. MR. MURRAY: That is about it, from the way I see it. 10 Does anybody have any other comments that they would 11 12 like to add before they accept a motion to adjourn? I will accept a motion to adjourn. 13 MR. FEYLING: I would make a motion to adjourn, 14 Mr. Chair. 15 Do I have a second? All in favor? 16 MR. MURRAY: 17 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye. Opposed? Thank you very much. I thank 18 MR. MURRAY: you very much for attending. 19 20 (End of recording.) ---000---21

24

UNIVERSITY REPORTERS 916.567.1550

22

23